

Social Questions Bulletin

Volume 47

APRIL, 1957

May 7

Number 5

The Methodist Federation for Social Action, an unofficial membership organization, founded in 1907, seeks to deepen within the Church, the sense of social obligation and opportunity to study, from the Christian point of view, social problems and their solutions and to promote social action in the spirit of Jesus. The Federation stands for the complete abolition of war. The Federation rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society and seeks to replace it with social-economic planning to develop a society without class or group discriminations and privileges. In seeking these objectives, the Federation does not commit its members to any specific program, but remains an inspirational and educational agency, proposing social changes by democratic decisions, not by violence.

IN HOUSE UN-AMERICANS; DEFEND THEIR VICTIMS

By LAWRENCE SPEISER*

The ACLU has opposed establishment and continuation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and will continue so.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities was established on May 26, 1938, to investigate: (1) The extent, character, objectives of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; (2) The diffusion in the United States of subversive and American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principles of the government as guaranteed by the Constitution, and; (3) Other questions related thereto that would aid Congress in necessary remedial legislation. It became a permanent committee in 1946 and its present powers are substantially the same as those conferred by the original resolution. Even without the denial of due process to witnesses who have been subpoenaed to appear before it, the House Committee's manner, the ACLU holds, unconstitutional.

It is given authority to inquire into the very area the First Amendment attempts to safeguard from congressional activity. Its mandate is filled with words and phrases which have assumed importance in American life but have as yet never been satisfactorily defined. In fact, the very title of the committee, "Un-American Activities," has still never been defined in a court of law or in any legislation; and attempts to do so have met with failure.

The committee has described its function as follows: It has the established policy of the House Committee on Un-American Activities since its inception that in a great, virile, republic like the United States, one of the most effective weapons against un-American activities is their continuous exposure to the spotlight of publicity. . . . As contrasted to the Grand Jury, the House Committee on Un-American Activities has a separate and a very special responsibility. It is to permit the greatest court in the world—the court of American public opinion—to have an indirect, uncensored and unbiased opportunity to render a continuing verdict on all its public officials and to evaluate the merit of many in our life who either openly associate and assist disloyal groups or overtly operate as members or fellow-travelers of such organizations. It's as necessary to the success of this committee to reveal its findings to the public as it is to the success of the FBI that it conceal its operations from the public view."

Eye—and there's the rub. Congressional investigating committees have traditionally had three proper functions: they may obtain information that will enable Congress to legislate wisely; they may undertake to check administrative agencies in their enforcement of law or expenditure of public funds; and, they may attempt to influence public opinion. It is fairly apparent that the Un-American Activities Committee's major interest is ast. However, they have gone beyond even these, and have developed two additional functions of their own.

First, it has tried, in a non-statutory way, to define "subversive" or "un-American activities" and thereby to set the standard of American thought and conduct with respect to orthodoxy and heresy in politics. Secondly, it has tried, in various ways, to take over the functions of administrative or judicial agencies in publicly trying people for undefined crimes.

These trials—and trials they are—are conducted without any of the protections of due process, which it has taken our system of law so many centuries to develop. People are tried without opportunity of cross-examining their accusers; they are tried without opportunity to subpoena witnesses or hold a defense of their own; they are tried without any statement of the charges against them. In a "trial" before the House Un-American Activities Committee in which a person's reputation, livelihood and professional career are at stake, he has no rights other than the rights the committee chooses to give him.

It is evident that there will be civil liberties issues arising wherever and whenever the House Committee on Un-American Activities holds hearings by reason of its very existence, its mandate, its methods of procedure, of denial of due process, as well as its history of trying people by publicity. It is for this reason that the ACLU offers its services to any and all individuals who are subpoenaed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities and will continue to do so.

* American Civil Liberties Union Attorney, San Francisco Chapter News.

SUPPORT MFSA PETITIONS TO CONGRESS

In the April Social Questions Bulletin, MFSA President Dr. Loyd F. Worley described petitions sent to MFSA to the House protesting and asking impartial investigation of the behavior of its Committee on Un-American Activities, and to the Senate asking investigation of the similar behaviour of its Eastland-led Sub-Committee on Internal Security. Without any hearing or due process whatever, the Eastland Committee published last year a patently false and absurd charge against MFSA. In a later publication the House Committee cited (and thus repeated) the false Eastland Committee charge. MFSA went to the courts last year for relief and was referred back to the Congress. These two committees have trampled on basic and precious American constitutional liberties of free religion, expression, and assembly. They mock due process and have long been out of hand. It is high time for an impartial and exhaustive investigation of the investigators. Write your Representative and your two Senators urging support for the MFSA petition.

50TH ANNIVERSARY NATIONAL MFSA MEETING

Place: Washington, D. C., where with Pres. Theodore Roosevelt's blessing, MFSA was founded by Methodist leaders, in 1907. Dodge Hotel, 20 E. St., N. W.

Time: July 17-19. Opening session, 10 a. m.

Speakers secured or invited: Senator Wayne Morse, Clarence

Jordan who leads Georgia's Koinonia Farm, labor leader John Ramsay's son who will tell of his C.O. experience; Prof. Louise Pettibone Smith who will illuminate the situation confronting our foreign born, Dr. Harry F. Ward who was MFSA Secretary for years and is one of its founders, Federation officers and secretaries.

REGISTER YOUR ATTENDANCE PLAN TODAY WITH THE DODGE HOTEL AND WITH MFSA, BOX 327, GRESHAM, OREGON. If you can't send yourself, please send a needed contribution now to help defray meeting costs. THANKS!

ANSWERS ON H-BOMB TESTS

By STANLEY H. CLARK*

1. Do we have to trust Russia to keep an agreement to stop H-Bomb tests?

No. If an H-Bomb is exploded in Russia we will know it in a matter of hours. President Eisenhower said on Oct. 6, "Tests of large weapons by any nation may be detected when they occur." Eisenhower's statement on Oct. 23, confuses this by saying that small ones may be missed. As a matter of fact, in 1949, the AEC reported detection of the first Soviet A-bomb test, "Joe I," which was nearly a thousand times smaller than the H-bomb test of March 1954. Japanese scientists regularly detect our Nevada tests which are limited to small weapons.

2. Would we lose our "lead" by stopping H-Bomb tests?

No: H-Bombs are primarily weapons of mass destruction, only a part of our arsenal of nuclear weapons. We don't need bigger H-Bombs: they are already big enough to wipe out the largest city on earth. Our H-Bombs now are better than the Russians' and they will stay that way if both sides stop tests. H-Bombs are cheap and easy to make; we can make enough to wipe out Russia twice over now, without further development.

3. Is the radioactive fallout from H-Bomb tests harmful?

Yes: the only uncertainty is how harmful.

There are two major hazards from the radioactive dust which is sent all over the world from H-Bomb tests. One is the damage done by radiation to reproductive chemical which causes bone cancer and leukemia.

President Eisenhower, in his statement of Oct. 23, says that present H-Bomb testing "does not imperil the health of humanity," citing a report prepared by the National Academy of Sciences. The actual report does not arrive at this conclusion. In fact it states (p. 23) "Any radiation is genetically undesirable, since any radiation induces harmful mutations" and (p. 27) "Since any additional radiation is genetically undesirable, the fallout dose is genetically undesirable." Dr. A. H. Sturtevant, one of the world's foremost geneticists, a member of the committee that prepared this report has taken strong exception to the optimistic interpretation made by the Administration.

4. How harmful is radiostrontium?

Extremely harmful: with respect to the radiostrontium hazard, we are told by Atomic Energy Commissioner W. F. Libby, that radiostrontium has already appeared in measurable quantities in the bones of children and in milk and cheese all over the world, where there was none before. The Radiation Hazards Committee of the Federation of American Scientists states, "It may well be true that in certain areas of the world, the strontium 90 hazard had already passed the danger point, to say nothing of the additional production of this material in further tests." According to Commissioner Libby, less than half of the radiostrontium created by past U. S. and Russian tests has fallen to earth from the stratosphere.

Anyone who says that radiation damage from H-Bomb tests is "negligible" is making a judgment on behalf of 2½ billion people. He may think the cost in personal tragedies is offset by other considerations, but the cost is there, and we have to pay it eventually. So far, this judgment has been made for us exclusively by the AEC, who did not even tell us about the radio-active fallout hazards until 11 months after it was discovered. Had it not been for the accidental exposure of 23 Japanese fishermen, we might not know it now.

The House Subcommittee on Military Operations states: "The AEC displays a kind of easy optimism about nuclear explosion effects. . . . The subcommittee sees no reason for withholding from the American people the full facts about the deadly effects of atomic and hydrogen bombs" (July, 1956).

5. How long will it be before many nations are testing H-Bombs?

The President's assistant for disarmament, H. E. Stassen, said last May, that possibly within a year, smaller nations will master the techniques of H-Bomb production.

6. Are there secret facts which dictate continuing H-Bomb tests?

The Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are supposed to have access to all facts. Thomas E. Murray, one of the five commissioners, and Senator Clinton Anderson, Chairman of the Joint Committee, have

publicly supported a ban on H-Bomb tests.

* Medical physicist at Cedars of Lebanon Hospital, Pres., Federation of American Scientists, Los Angeles Chapter. Some Calif. Institute of technology scientists collaborated in these answers to questions from southern Calif. housewives. Help stop these poison-spreading tests (now continuing in Nevada) by wiring Pres. Eisenhower (White House, Wash., D. C.) Hon. Harold Stassen, Chairman, U. S. Disarmament Delegation, American Embassy, London, England, airmail. Ask acceptance of our offer to join us and England in immediate suspension of nuclear tests—as demanded by Dr. Schweitzer, the Pope, British Labor Party, German Parliament, governments of India and Japan, etc.

THE TIME TO DISARM IS NOW

The arms race, in which the United States and Soviet Union are major antagonists, threatens ourselves and the world to global suicide.

Mankind's future, both East and West, capitalist or communist or neutral, may well be at stake in the disarmament negotiations now taking place in the U.N. Subcommittee on armament in London. Hon. Harold Stassen (c/o U. S. Embassy, London) leads our delegation in these fateful meetings. He and President Eisenhower have voiced the view the Soviet Union evidences in these negotiations the serious major purpose achieving a practical first step disarmament-and-inspection agreement—as opposed to a purpose of simply making propaganda out of the sessions. Soviet need for vast economic development and higher living standards, is thwarted by diversion of national power and production for arms and military preparation. So leaders must know as well as our own that global atomic-hydrogen war would be suicidal. In an armed-camp world, such (whether started by accident or design) is always possible.

These disarmament imperatives are valid not alone for Soviet Union, but for other nations also, including our own. President Eisenhower, May 22, "in the interest of the United States" urged "supreme effort to reach disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union" and "end the arms race. In what amount to sharp rebuke for the attitude stated by Admiral Radford, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff ('We cannot trust the Soviets on anything.'), the President said the U. S. 'first concern was to make sure 'we are not ourselves being recalcitrant' 'picayunish'." (NY Times, 5-23-57.)

Secretary Dulles told the Associated Press annual luncheon on April 22:

The primary task is to deter war. Modern weapons have such destructive power there could be no real "victor" were general war to occur. Controls and reduction of arms are possible, desirable, and the last reckoning, indispensable. It is not essential that controls compass everything at once.

Treasury Secretary Humphrey, in a recent interview with U. S. News & World Report, said one U. S. worker in every is busy producing arms, and,

Pretty near all armament is unproductive. Seven men are producing goods for living in America and eight men are getting payroll checks. You can't help pressure on prices. The eighth man is producing something only good for war and rapidly becomes obsolete and worthless. You can't eat arms; you can't use them; they aren't tools to make jobs for anybody; they don't help living at all, except to protect lives in the meantime. Depression will come if we keep on spending nearly 50 billion dollars a year in preparing for war . . . in 10 years 500 billion dollars—far more than our total Government debt. money didn't do much of anything to build up the country for people living and new future jobs. The whole world is spending much for armaments. We will all be smart enough someday to some satisfactory system which will cut this expense.

April 20 the Soviet Union advanced nine significant armament-with-inspection proposals, one of which calls for aerial photography (first suggested by Eisenhower at Geneva) over 7,129,000 square kilometers of eastern Soviet and 7,063,000 square kilometers of western U. S. territory. The Soviet proposal would likely be involved if the Soviets ever planned a transpolar air attack on the U. S. Complete text of the nine Soviet proposals is in the May 15 NY Times, which you can order, borrow at your local library. Study them and forthcoming U. S. counter-proposals. They are basis for current, fateful negotiations.

Soviet and western positions on disarmament and inspection, once so far apart, are now so close to one another, it will be inexcusable for the London meetings to conclude without at least some limited first-step agreement—which is in the urgent interest of our nation and the world. If you agree, send your views to Mr. Stassen and President Eisenhower (addresses above). Back them with your prayers and letters in any steps toward ending the arms race and starting disarmament now.

SUPPLEMENT TO SOCIAL QUESTIONS BULLETIN, MAY 1957
BOX 327, GRESHAM, OREGON

A CATASTROPHE THAT MUST BE PREVENTED

"The health of hundreds, if not thousands, of human beings has been or will be seriously affected by radioactive materials already liberated." -- Dr. Charles C. Price, Chairman of Federation of American Scientists, Dec. 14, 1956.

"Geneticists ... all come out with the unanimous conclusion that the potential danger is great." -- From report, The Biological Effects of Atomic Radiation, by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, June, 1956.

"British scientists estimated tonight that a hydrogen bomb exploded high in the atmosphere might eventually produce bone cancer in 1,000 persons for each explosive unit in the bomb equivalent to a million tons of TNT..... The report (by the Atomic Scientists' Association) said: 'These thousand casualties would be spread all over the world and occur in the course of several decades.' " -- New York Times, April 17, 1957.

"Every increase in the existing danger through further creation of radioactive elements by atom bomb explosions (is) a catastrophe for the human race, a catastrophe that must be prevented." -- Dr. Albert Schweitzer, April 23, 1957.

"None of the undersigned are ready to take any part in any way in the manufacture, testing or use of atomic weapons." -- From statement signed by 18 of Germany's leading physicists, among them 4 Nobel Prize winners, including Otto Hahn, the first physicist to split the atom. Suddeutsche Zeitung, April 13-14, 1957.

"Instead of the exhausting and costly race toward death, the scientists of all nations and all faiths must feel grave moral obligation to pursue the noble aim of harnessing these energies for the service of man." -- Pope Pius XII, April 24, 1957.

"The American Friends Service Committee wishes to associate itself with Dr. Albert Schweitzer's recent appeal for the discontinuance of nuclear tests by all nations. We welcome the growing public opinion that presses governments to agree on discontinuance. Besides the biological dangers which he mentioned we would emphasize the moral reasons which condemn both war and preparations for it." -- Henry J. Cadbury, Chairman, American Friends Service Committee, April 27, 1957.

This petition is being circulated by the American Friends Service Committee, New England Region, as a public service. We invite you to add your name to it. The signed petitions will be sent to President Eisenhower, and an announcement of the number of signers from each State will be sent to him and to the members of Congress, and released to the press.

Signed petitions should be returned to, and additional copies of this petition may be obtained free from, the A.F.S.C., P.O. Box 247, Cambridge 38, Mass. Contributions to help meet the costs of printing and distributing the petitions are welcome.

To PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER
The White House
Washington, D. C.

We, the undersigned, urgently call upon you to take vigorous steps to effect a ban on the testing of nuclear bombs.

The stopping of nuclear tests would go a long way toward halting the spread of the nuclear arms race to other nations. It would stop the increasing danger from radioactive fall-out. It would be a dramatic moral act which would ease tensions and create the political climate for positive steps to peace.

This step in the direction of disarmament would need no inspection system, since scientists state that nuclear bomb tests can be detected by present monitoring methods.

We urge you to give this petition by citizens your most serious consideration.

NAME _____ ADDRESS _____

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

6. _____

7. _____

8. _____

9. _____

10. _____

11. _____

12. _____

13. _____

14. _____

15. _____

16. _____

17. _____

18. _____

19. _____

20. _____

NATOR MORSE CHALLENGES LIGIOUS LEADERS

"A conscientious, critical, constructive discussion of government policies, both foreign and domestic, is almost absent. The one that calls for deliberation and analysis of a life or death issue such as confronts us in the Middle East is shouted down—down—down grounds that a terrible emergency exists."

"The Eisenhower administration, and the president himself, enjoyed an immunity from critical appraisal almost unknown in American history. I fear for the consequences of this renunciation of responsibility on the part of American intellectual and spiritual leaders. I fear for it because we are no longer in age when a wrong or mistaken policy can be reversed and what was lost reclaimed . . .

"I have found little disposition on the part of the clergy generally to draw the issue with those responsible for our failure in the field of education. I have found little disposition on the part of the clergy, or of American spiritual and intellectual leadership as a whole, to insist that the present administration return the fundamental objective of our government, namely, the motion of the general welfare.

"What I do see is a blind, uncritical acceptance of the traps of spirituality in place of the substance of moral responsibility in high office. . . . The clergy has, I believe, been as ready as any other group—and I regret to say this—to accept this worthy substitute. It has, generally speaking, accepted the term without demanding the substance of ethical behavior in public office. It has done this with regard to the programs and policies of government, and it has done so with regard to the nomination of individuals who hold public office. . . .

"More so than any other social group, excepting possibly the press, the religious leadership of America has an obligation to serve the political truth."

HELP END CIVIL RIGHTS SABOTAGE

Despite election-time promises by both major political parties, the congressional record for years has been one of sabotage in the vital field of civil rights legislation. The minimum civil rights measure advanced by the Eisenhower Administration and stressing additional guarantees of the right to vote, is HR 6127 in the House and S 83 in the Senate. This won House Judiciary Committee approval only to be bottled up in the House Rules Committee led by civil rights foe Howard W. Smith (of the Smith Act). It won Senate Judiciary Subcommittee approval only to be bottled up similarly by the full Committee led by civil rights foe Eastland. In both House and Senate the Administration measure has been subjected to long delays by parliamentary haggling and tricks, preparatory to an expected Senate minority filibuster. Civil rights foe Senator McClellan sought to alienate trade union support by attaching an irrelevant "right-work" (i.e., without union security or membership) rider—a move which might give pause to those labor leaders who have given unreserved backing to the McClellan Committee's investigative attacks on Teamster Union leaders.

Without strong, sustained pressure from aroused citizens, another session of Congress will adjourn without a civil rights bill, not even the minimum Administration one. Won't you write your Representative and Senators insisting that the majority assist itself and that there be no further capitulation to rule by minority filibuster in this crucial field of human rights? A largely white world is waiting to see what we do.

HOLMES AND BRANDEIS DISSENTING"

By W. W. REID

Everyone who espouses a "cause"—be it social, religious, or political—feels at times discouraged and frustrated. "Is it worth the time, the effort, the misunderstanding and mis-interpretation of friends?" The sensitive—and often lonely—Christian teacher must occasionally ask himself, "Is the world getting better because of my preaching?—because of all the services and services of the weeks and years?"

Perhaps the extreme statement of this sense of futility are

the lines (taken almost always out of the context of Lowell's genuine long-range optimism), "Right forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne." But neither general history nor the experience and observation of any one approaching three-score years and ten can be used to prove such a point of argument.

The New York Times, the other day, called attention to the famed legal battles of the early part of this century—with many U. S. Supreme Court decisions ending with what became a by-word of liberalism, "Holmes and Brandeis dissenting." These "dissents" of the minority of the Court were mostly in the areas of freedom of speech, freedom of press, trade unionism, states rights, questions of corporation rights, powers of Congress, etc. Yet these minority opinions, the Times notes, were studied more eagerly and earnestly than the conservative majority votes; and these minority dissents showed the path that future legislation was to take in this country. Yesterday's minority dissent became, with the years, the enactments of Congress, the opinions of the majority: Holmes and Brandeis were merely ahead of their fellows, but pioneering the road. The Times speaks of this as "the immortality of the idea."

I have heard Norman Thomas say—and I have read the same from Eugene V. Debs—that much social legislation first suggested early in this century by the minority party they represented has now been enacted into law by the majority parties—Republicans and Democrats often vying with each other as to which will "advocate and adopt" a measure first. If one will look at party platforms, say from 1910 to 1925, he will find the "liberal legislation" we now accept in public housing, hours of labor, social security, care of women and children, health care, free higher education, race equality, minimum salaries, unemployment insurance, right to work, and many other measures of social advancement, were first proposed by minority parties or groups, later accepted by the majority. In some cases, "late advocates" of liberal measures went even more "to the left" than did the early proponents. In many cases, alas, the minority proposers never lived to see "the immortality of the idea" they "let loose in the land."

Even our Master himself appears sometimes to have felt discouraged that after three years (long to him then; brief in Christian history) the disciples had questions of doubt, the masses were easily weaned away. "How long have I been with you? . . ." And the long line of saints, the martyrs, and pioneers—from the eleven men huddled in a room in Jerusalem to the churchmen behind curtains in Europe and Asia this day—have all been "in the minority," "in dissent," alone and often forsaken and frustrated. But, through it all, "the idea" that was born into the world with Jesus is, like Him, immortal. It is still a "minority report" in our world (too many millions who give it lip-service actually "voting with the opposition"), but any idea that has been kept alive for twenty centuries even by a small minority has in it the touch of immortality and it will triumph.

No minister or layman holding to "the idea" and the ideal, minority among men though he may be, need ever feel he is "alone," he is "getting nowhere," his is not helping build a better world. Today's minority, plus God, becomes tomorrow's majority. Today's "dissent" becomes tomorrow's accepted belief and rule. Holmes and Brandeis, the lone preacher and the handful with "the idea," dissenting, point the road for the slower majority.

SOCIAL QUESTIONS BULLETIN

\$2.00 per year.

25c per copy.

Issued monthly, October through May, and one summer issue.

METHODIST FEDERATION for SOCIAL ACTION

An un-official fellowship founded in 1907.

President, Dr. Loyd F. Worley; Vice-Presidents, Rev. Frederick E. Ball, Rev. Lee H. Ball; Prof. George H. Colliver, Rev. Clarence T. R. Nelson, Rev. Elwin E. Wilson; Recording Secretaries, Mrs. Ella Mulkey, Miss Janice Roberts; Treasurer, Rev. Edward L. Peet.

Membership and West Coast Field Secretary, Rev. Mark A. Chamberlin

Editor, "Social Questions Bulletin," Rev. Jack R. McMichael

Editorial Office and Office of Publication

P. O. Box 327, Gresham, Oregon.



Re-entered as second class matter Sept. 15, 1953, at the Postoffice at Gresham, Oregon, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

BEHIND THE HEADLINES

In the last week of April the headlines suddenly proclaimed that the President was trying to bring the internal crisis in Jordan within the scope of the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine for the Mid-East. Then they shouted that the administration had made a show of force by sending the Sixth Fleet, with its mighty aircraft carrier Forrestal, hurrying back from the Western to the Eastern end of the Mediterranean.

Jordan is a small Arab kingdom mostly composed of the parts of Palestine not occupied by Israel and half of Jerusalem. Until last year it has been controlled by Britain through the training and command of its army and an annual subsidy of \$30,000,000. We have been hoping to get it into the Baghdad Pact, the Mid-East cousin of NATO and SEATO. Its King Hussein has preferred to remain in a fourfold alliance with Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia. He relies upon Syrian troops on its border with Israel to protect it from invasion there. Since the internal crisis began he has been helped to repress the opposition by troops from King Saud. For some time our press has been proclaiming the likelihood of Jordan's being federated with Syria and Saudi-Arabia or being divided between them and Israel. When the King brought the crisis to a head by dismissing his premier and failing to get a stable cabinet, our administration "deployed its political and military power to assure the survival of an independent Jordan."

The political move was described as laying the ground work for possible intervention. This was done by the President from his Augusta golf course cottage, after a phone talk with Dulles, authorizing his press secretary to announce that the President desired to call attention to this sentence in the Joint Resolution of Congress on the Mid-East doctrine: "The United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East."

These generalizations in no way call for the intervention envisaged in the Mid-East doctrine and authorized by Congress. That is limited to "armed aggression by a nation controlled by international communism," and then only on request of the threatened victim. The latter condition is the safety brake. The Senate debate shows that without it the doctrine would never have been approved. The Administration did not dare submit its proposal without that check. Consequently the N. Y. Times correctly commented that the President's move amounted to an invitation to King Hussein to request our intervention. This was a breach of faith with Congress. In a business agreement it would be called a fraud. This is a sample of what the blind anti-communist, pro-communist cold war is doing to our political morality.

In an obvious attempt to repair the situation the State Department issued a supplementary statement saying the President's reminder was appropriate because of the threat to the independence of Jordan by international communism, "as King Hussein himself stated." But the Mid-East doctrine is not supposed to operate on the basis of the threat of international communism. It requires specific armed aggression. Furthermore, Hussein's remark was the usual use of communism as a scapegoat for all political troubles, when he lost his first cabinet. When his second premier resigned he accused him and his National Socialist Party of having fomented the disturbances. When he installed martial law he closed down all political parties, and later all labor unions. Then he correctly blamed the Cairo radio and Syrian propaganda for inciting the riots. He also declared he was not interested in intervention under the Mid-East doctrine since he was already stopping communism. He added that he had not changed his opposition to joining the Baghdad pact.

The State Department's attempt to exonerate Dulles and the President by bringing the threat of international communism into a situation that our press correspondents correctly described as an outbreak of anti-Western anti-imperialist emotions flatly contradicts their commitments to Congress when they were seeking support for the Mid-East doctrine. Before the Senate Committee on foreign relations, Dulles repeatedly emphasized that the doctrine did not assume any obligation to take military action against indirect aggression or subversion. He added that the administration did not identify Egypt and Syria (who have aided the recent outbreaks in Jordan) as "states controlled by interna-

tional communism," the requirement for action under the Mid-East doctrine. In reply to Senator Fulbright, the State Department put this in writing and made it include all governments in the Mid-East.

The press reports division in the State Department regarding action against indirect aggression. Those who are for classifying the suppressed parties in Jordan as either agents or dupes of international communism. Without armed aggression from without this is no ground for intervention under the Mid-East doctrine. It is the familiar pattern used on the home front by our witch hunters, official and private. Its use by the State Department would bring our foreign policy down to that level.

The absence of any ground for intervention in Jordan under the Mid-East doctrine as approved by Congress leaves the hast shifting of the Sixth Fleet and the stressing of its air offensive without a shred of justification. On whom and to what end except everlasting infamy could its bombs have been dropped? Did the senseless and perilous threat have a single thread of connection with Egypt and Syria ending their propaganda and repairing their alliance with Hussein? All that it accomplished was to put us down on the level of imperialist Britain in the 19th century, and completely destroy any good will gained in the Mid-East, Far-East, Africa, and the islands of the seven seas by our opposition to the British and French attack on Egypt.

The question this incident raises is whether this nation, and particularly its religious leaders, will realize where the cold war reliance upon force leads before it makes the move to the brink of uncontrollable disaster that will make the edge give way beneath them. How much longer are we going to commit our destiny to the kind of people who can console themselves for rejection of their leadership by Hussein with the remark that if the alleged plot to overthrow him had succeeded Jordan would have become a republic.

Consider the danger to the freedom, the religion, the future of this land and its people from experts in the diplomatic strategy of the cold war who conclude that the "new willingness of the Soviet Union to negotiate on disarmament" is due to three things that have gone against them in the last year: the move for independence in their "satellites"; the superior forces brought into the Mid-East by the United States to replace those of the British; the ability of the U. S. through its allies to reach the Soviet Union with guided missiles while the lack allied territory through which to reach us. Here is something more evil, and more terribly dangerous, than the irreligious reliance upon force. Here is willingness to commit mass murder under the delusion that it can be done with impunity. How long are we going to permit such policy makers to have control of the weapons of total destruction?

Is it not time for the religious conscience of all faiths to unite and put an end to such criminal madness? Is it not time for our religious leaders, as our colored brethren are doing in their great need, to find ways and means to express in concrete form at our national seat of power the demands of our religion in behalf of the future of mankind to end this wholly immeasurably wicked business of nuclear and guided missiles?

H.F.W.

TAKE ADVANTAGE OF SPECIAL ANNIVERSARY RATES

To gain many new Bulletin subscribers and MFSA voting members, our national office has offered temporary reduced 50th Anniversary rates: Bulletin subscriptions for \$1.00 and voting membership for \$3.00. SEND TODAY YOUR ORDER FOR NEW SUBS AND MEMBERSHIPS TO: MFSA, BOX 327 GRESHAM, OREGON.

PLAN A MEETING FOR MFSA'S MEMBERSHIP SECRETARY

Rev. Mark Chamberlin, MFSA Membership Secretary, plans to leave national headquarters in Oregon on June 24, enroute to the national 50th Anniversary MFSA meeting in Washington July 17-19.

Please write or wire him immediately if you will arrange a meeting or conference with him for MFSA.